REMARKS

Claims 49-59 are pending, of which Claims 49 and 59 are independent. All claims have been objected to and/or rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and/or 103(a). The objections and rejections are respectfully traversed. For the reasons set forth below, all claims are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

Claim 52 has been objected to based on informalities. In response, Claim 52 is amended. Reconsideration of the objection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 49 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 for insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the local device." In response, Claim 49 is amended to provide sufficient antecedent basis. Reconsideration of the § 112 rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 49-57 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0011270 to Himmelstein in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,321,158 to DeLorme. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

For explanation, but without limitation to the claims, certain embodiments will be described. A group of computers are identified that are associated with a common geographic location. Distributed processing tasks for indexing websites that are associated with the location can be allocated to the group of computers. By grouping computers together and assigning these computers similar processing tasks to create a geographically bounded network, distributed processing tasks can be assigned according to a rational process, thereby increasing resource efficiency and facilitating the development of a geographically bounded community. Further, by storing and indexing geographically bounded content on a computer, such as a tablet device, and making this content available offline, a user has the ability to use the tablet device while traveling without connecting to the Internet. The user can use the tablet device to find out

information about businesses that are located within the geographically bounded region, e.g. the physical location of the tablet device. In this way, advertisements for a business can be generated when the tablet device is physically located near that business.

By way of contrast, with conventional distributed crawlers, identification and allocation of distributed processing tasks have been somewhat arbitrary. For example, conventional distributing computing models present problems in that the user of the client computer has no control over which pages his computer crawls. Often the user's computing power will be expended as a result of crawling pages that are of no interest to the user.

With the claimed approach, however, a group of computers are identified that are associated with a common geographic location. Distributed processing tasks for indexing websites that are associated with the location can be allocated to the group of computers. By grouping computers together and assigning these computers similar processing tasks to create a geographically bounded network, distributed processing tasks can be assigned according to a rational process, thereby increasing resource efficiency and facilitating the development of a geographically bounded community. Further, by storing and indexing geographically bounded content on a tablet device and making this content available offline, a user has the ability to use the tablet device while traveling without connecting to the Internet. The user can use the tablet device to find out information about businesses that are located within the geographically bounded region, e.g. the physical location of the tablet device. In this way, advertisements for a business can be generated when the tablet device is physically located near that business.

Conversely, Himmelstein relates to an approach to improving searching that involves geocoding web pages by extracting spatial datum information associated with the page. Himmelstein discusses using a indexing/crawling technique that extracts the geocode that is embedded within the page. This ties the page to a particular geographical region.

Himmelstein does not contemplate the inventive geographically bounded network, which is created by a distributed network of computers. Specifically, Himmelstein does not discuss the claimed invention that identifies a plurality of computers associated with the geographically bounded region, the computers to perform distributed processing tasks to enable the creation of a geographically bounded searchable index of electronic documents, as set forth in amended Claim 49. With the present invention, a list of geographically bounded URL addresses are created and

the geographically bounded URLS are assigned to computers to perform distributed indexing to create the geographically bounded searchable index for local retrieval. In contrast, Himmelstein does not discuss a methodical distributed approach for geographically based indexing to facilitate the creation of a geographically bounded searchable index. Rather Himmelstein merely discusses searching the web for pages to index so that the geocode associated with the pages can be extracted; whereas the present invention creates and maintains a list of URLS that are geographically bounded and the URLS are assigned to specific computers for indexing.

As such, Himmelstein does not relate to the inventive technique of identifying (e.g. grouping) computers together and assigning these computers similar indexing processing tasks to create a geographically bounded network. With the inventive techique, distributed processing tasks can be assigned according to a rational process. Indeed, a geo-indexing system of the Himmelstein type does not even contemplate increasing resource efficiency to facilitate the development of a geographically bounded community. Specifically, Himmelstein is not even concerned with the overhead involved with geography based indexing, nor does Himmelstein suggest that resource efficiency is even an issue. As such, Himmelstein does not address the problems associated with indexing overhead, nor does Himmelstein suggests the solutions provided by the claimed invention.

Moreover, as correctly noted by the Examiner, Himmelstein does not teach storing the geographically bounded searchable index locally on a hard drive of a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index is accessible offline from the local hard drive without accessing the computer network. As such, Himmelstein does not contemplate the mobile tablet device of the present invention that stores the geographically bounded searchable index, and enables this content to be accessible without connecting to a computer network. Thus, Himmelstein does not discuss the inventive tablet solutions of the present invention.

To show the inventive notion of a tablet device storing geographically bounded searchable index locally on a hard drive of a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index is accessible offline from the local hard drive without, the Examiner cites DeLorme. As discussed in more detail below, however, DeLorme does not relate to inventive tablet solutions of the present invention.

DeLorme discusses a conventional handheld GPS navigation system that provides

mapping information about user defined points of interest, which has been uploaded from a desktop computer. The Examiner cites to sections of DeLome in which internet related features of DeLome's system are mentioned, such that its mapping database may be accessed via the Internet or remote wireless connections. (See DeLome at Co. 7, ll. 1-4; 8, ll. 25-52). In addition, these cited sections of DeLome discuss that the DeLome navigation system has LAN capability to enable it update its map, route and point of interest information using this connection.

To begin with, DeLome does not relate to a web-based indexing system that creates a geographical searchable index stored on a tablet for offline retrieval. In fact, DeLome does not even suggest the inventive approach of accessing webpages to create an offline searchable index of web-based geographically bounded content. DeLome's map related content for its navigation system is not created by web-crawlers. As such, DeLome's system is non-analogous art as it does not store a geographically bounded index of web-based content extracted by web crawlers and spiders.

Thus, DeLome's PDA navigation system is not a tablet storing a geographically bounded searchable index of electronic documents that are obtained through geographically bounded electronic addresses, as set forth in the claimed invention. As such, DeLome does not discuss storing indexed web content on a tablet for offline retreival, and therefore, does not discuss the limitations or the advantages of the claimed invention.

Furthermore, neither DeLome nor Himmelstein, taken alone or in combination, discuss the claimed storing the geographically bounded searchable index locally on a local hard drive of a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index is accessible offline from the local hard drive without accessing the computer network. **In fact, neither of the cited references contemplate the inventive notion of storing on a tablet an offline searchable subset of the internet that is geographically bounded**. Further, it is well known in the art that it is typically considered ill advised to make a such a subset of the Internet available offline, for fear that this information will become stale. However, the present invention provides a distributed processing approach for indexing the geographically bounded sites to help ensure the freshness of the content. As such, neither of these references discuss the inventive concept of creating an offline geographically based subset of the internet, and therefore, neither of the references disclose the advantages of the present invention.

Therefore, neither reference, taken alone or in combination, discusses the limitations of the claimed invention, namely:

- creating and maintaining a list of attribute bounded electronic addresses representing a plurality of indexable electronic documents, on a computer network, that are associated with a geographically bounded region, where the computer network is the Internet;
- identifying a plurality of computers associated with the geographically bounded region the computers to perform distributed processing tasks to enable the creation of a geographically bounded searchable index of electronic documents;
- in response to receiving a geographically bounded request from one of the computers, assigning one or more geographically bounded electronic addresses from the geographically bounded list;
- sending the assigned geographically bounded electronic address to the requesting computer, where the requesting computer processes the assigned geographically bounded electronic address to index one or more electronic documents that are obtained through the assigned geographically bounded electronic address;
- creating a geographically bounded searchable index of the electronic documents that are obtained through the assigned geographically bounded electronic address; and
- storing the geographically bounded searchable index locally on a local hard drive of a tablet device, where the geographically bounded searchable index is accessible offline from the local hard drive without accessing the computer network,

as set forth in Claim 49. As such, it is respectfully requested that the § 103(a) rejection based on Himmelstein and DeLoreme of Claim 49 and its respective dependent claims be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim 58 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Himmelstein in view of DeLoreme and U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0038348 to Malone. For reasons similar to those set forth above regarding Claim 49, namely, that the references do not discuss the inventive distributed network of computers that create a geographically bounded

searchable index stored on a tablet device that enables access to the content without connecting to a computer network, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Malone relates to a distributed network in which storage and indexing of web content can be distributed to several computing devices. Malone does not contemplate the mobile tablet device of the present invention that stores and indexes geographically bounded content, and enables that content to be accessible without connecting to a computer network. Thus, Malone does not address the problems associated with travelers who want information quickly about local business, without being connected to the Internet. As such, Malone does not discuss the problems solved by the inventive tablet of the present invention.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By /Giovanna H. Fessenden, Reg. No. 60264/
Giovanna H. Fessenden
Registration No. 60,264
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133
Date: May 27, 2008